



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,230	08/08/2001	Ruth E. Rosenholtz	110269	9875
27074	7590	11/29/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ZHOU, TING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/682,230

Applicant(s)

ROSENHOLTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Ting Zhou

Art Unit

2173

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-22 and 26-28.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 10/26/04.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
JOHN CABECA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because the arguments are not persuasive.

Referring to claim 1, the applicant asserts that Hahn et al. fail to teach or suggest that the thumbnail as a whole is selectable and having an original document as a first associated destination but instead merely states that a selected page from a thumbnail is displayed in a document view region. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As recited in column 11, lines 33-56, whole thumbnails such as the thumbnails represented by reference character 1730 in Figure 16, are selectable. Furthermore, the thumbnails represented by reference character 1730 have an original document as a first associated destination, i.e. the page of the document associated with the thumbnail. Therefore, the thumbnail as a whole can be selected to display the first associated destination of the pages of the document associated with the thumbnails. Furthermore, the applicant asserts that the thumbnail has a second associated destination of one of (a) a portion of the original document smaller than the original document as a whole and (b) a document other than the original document. The examiner will consider option (a) as an example. Hahn et al. teach that "the user can also directly select a portion of a thumbnail page and in response, the selected portion is displayed in the document view region", on column 12, lines 24-30. As seen from the cited passage, the thumbnail can be selected to display a particular portion of the document page. Therefore, the user has the capability of selecting the thumbnail as a whole to display the whole page associated with the thumbnail and selecting the thumbnail to display only a desired portion of the associated page. As a result, the examiner contends that Hahn et al. anticipates claim 1.

Referring to claim 4, the applicant asserts that Hahn et al. fail to teach that the first selectable element has, as an associated destination, one of (a) an arbitrary portion of the original document accessible by selection of a second selectable element provided in the original document and (b) a document other than the original document, and that the associated destination is directly accessed based on a selection of the first selectable element. The examiner respectfully disagrees and will consider option (a) as an example. The applicant asserts that the directly accessed section in Hahn is merely a section that corresponds to the selected section in a thumbnail and therefore Hahn does not teach an arbitrary position accessible by a second selectable element in the original document since in Hahn, the user has to retrieve the selectable element in the original document by selecting the corresponding section in the thumbnail, and then select the selectable element in the original document to access the arbitrary destination. However, even if the user has to retrieve the selectable element in the original document by selecting the corresponding section in the thumbnail first and then select the selectable element in the original document to access the arbitrary position as suggested by the applicant on page 4 of the response filed on 20 August 2004, an arbitrary destination is still associated with the selectable element of the thumbnail; in other words, an arbitrary portion of the original document is still accessible by selection of a second selectable element even if the user has to select a corresponding section in the thumbnail first and then select the selectable element. As a result, the examiner contends that Hahn et al. anticipates claim 4.

Referring to claim 9, the applicant asserts that Brown does not teach or suggest an enhanced thumbnail that has an element with a modified appearance relative to an appearance of a corresponding element in the original document. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As recited in column 9, line 63 - column 10, line 25, Brown et al. teach for example, a thumbnail with a dark border placed around the thumbnail. Therefore, an element of the thumbnail, i.e. the border, or edges of the thumbnail is modified with a dark border relative to the corresponding element in the original document, i.e. the border or edges of the page represented by the thumbnail. It is noted that according to <http://www.webopedia.com>, a thumbnail is a "miniature display of a page to be printed; in other words, a thumbnail is an actual, smaller-sized representation of a corresponding original document, with elements of the thumbnail representing corresponding elements of the original document. Therefore, the border of the thumbnail represents the corresponding border of the original document. Brown teaches modifying the appearance of the border of the thumbnail with a dark border around the edges whereas the corresponding element of the edges of the original document does not have a darkened border. As a result, the examiner contends that Brown et al. anticipate the limitations of claim 9 argued by the applicant.

In view of the foregoing, the examiner contends that the applicant's arguments do not place the application in condition for allowance.